General Plan 2020 Steering Committee Meeting
July 27, 2002 –Minutes

Attendees:

Margarette Morgan	Bonsall
Chuck Davis	Bonsall
Tim McMaster	Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills
Shirley J. Fisher	Jacumba
Pat Brown	Julian
Shirley Driscoll	Lake Morena/ Campo
Richard Hensle	Lakeside
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona
John Ferguson	Spring Valley
Don Fritzges	Tecate
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Larry Galvinic	Valley Center

Visitors:

Mary Allison	USDRC
Charlene Ayer	Public
Pearl Beam	Public
Keith Behner	Rancho Santa Fe Association
Antoine Botter	Lakeside
John H. Bruce	Carter Kennel
Julie Bugbee	Public, Lakeside
Dan Cary	Public, Lakeside
Earl Chenowth	Public, Lakeside
Bernard Clauss	Clauss Construction (Lakeside)
T. D. Cornog	Public
V. W. Cornog	Public
Kevin Davis	Public
Ralph Gauer	Public, Lakeside
Pat Jacobs	Public
Satchiko Kohatsu	Supervisor Slater's Office
David Kreitzer	Planning Commission
Rodney Nowak	Public, Lakeside
Eluin Schooward	Public, Lakeside
Florence Schooward	Public, Lakeside
Billy Stovall	Public, Lakeside
Marion Stovall	Public, Lakeside
News Media (Bill)	Lakeside
Jan van Dierendonck	Ramona
Constance Vnuck	Public, Lakeside
Mark Tunvey	Public

Planning Commissioner:
Michael Beck

County:
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Rosemary Rowan (DPLU)
Sandra Gillins (DPLU)
Dahvia Locke-Rubinstein (DPLU)

Meeting Commenced at 9:05 am.

First Agenda Item: Introductions

Second Agenda Item: Discussion on the Regional Land Use Framework (continued from 7.13.02)
Planning Commissioner Michael Beck introduced the continuation of the discussion about the proposed Land Use Designations, beginning with the non-residential designations. In particular, he re-introduced the topic of Commercial and Industrial designations, beginning with the proposal of utilizing a new category of "Medium Impact Industrial" in lieu of "Service Commercial".

G. Jemmot: I (Twin Oaks) have provided copies of a resolution to address general County issues with annexations. Twin Oaks is particularly interested in this because nearby neighbors want to annex our property and change its zoning radically. If they do this in an incremental fashion, they will just nibble us away until we're gone and we'll be not the rural neighborhood that we enjoy, but high-density development. Basically, this is looking at the fact that people put a lot of effort into GP2020 and it is requesting (reads resolution): "Request County officials and staff look at projects proposed for annexation to see if they meet the General Plan, whether its compatible Zoning and Community Character and, if found to not comply, the County would defend County residents through the GP2020 process from annexations that are incompatible." We are looking vote to adopt the resolution.

J. Phillips: We have much the same problem. Everything this gentleman has put on this paper is something that unincorporated communities can easily support, and should, in my view, support because of the kinds of "creeping annexations" that eventually dissolve a community.

MOTION: (J. Phillips) Adopt the Twin Oaks proposal as a resolution of the Steering Committee.

M. Morgan: We're having the same problem in Bonsall, both with Oceanside and Vista. I also wrote to Senator (Moreau) after having received information from G. Jemmott on the challenge that was going on in order to basically uphold and lend another letter to this issue. In (my letter), I requested that they notify the Sponsor and/ or Planning Groups that are going to be affected because, at the current time, that's not on their list- we are not considered an "agency".
Seconded MOTION.

D. van Dierendonck: I would support the MOTION based on the fact that Ramona sits pretty well out in the boonies, but not so far that the Airport Authority isn't looking at it. And while a lot of people think it's a joke, as long as that name is on the list, it is a possibility. I would support it and go along with Margarette's suggestion that all Planning and Sponsor Groups be

covered under this request to protect us from annexation by an entity that does not have anything to do with County government, but who is trying to dribble their influence onto us.

Commissioner Beck: I think that (the Resolution) is written so that if this group adopts it, we can all use it.

J. Ferguson: I will vote against this because, in this case, our interests are opposite from the rest of the County. We would love to be out from under the thumb of the County.

T. McMaster: Our Planning Group will support this because we have continuing encroachment from the City of El Cajon.

Vote on MOTION: Favor 11; Oppose 1; Abstain 1.

Medium Impact Industrial (I-2)
Commissioner Beck opened discussion on "Medium Impact Industrial".

J. Ferguson: What is going to happen to C37?

R. Rowan: The proposal is to let communities decide how to re-designate that land, either as "Medium Industrial" or "General Commercial". Typically, those would be the two choices. If the existing use in an area is appropriate for a "Medium Industrial" use, then the communities would re-designate the land as "Medium Industrial". We're proposing to subdivide Industrial designations into three parts instead of the two that we currently have. Currently, we have "Low Impact Industrial" and "General Impact Industrial". The "General Impact Industrial" has a pretty wide range of uses. We're proposing to subdivide that and include a "Medium Impact Industrial" and what would be included in that is a current M54 zone, as well as the three "Service Commercial" zones. It would be up to the communities whether to identify various lands in their communities as "High Impact-", "Medium Impact-", or "Low Impact Industrial" depending on the type of area and the nature of the community and the adjacent land uses. If the land is appropriate for "General Commercial", then you would probably designate it as "General Commercial".

M. Beck: Is it clear (to the group) that this is not the elimination of categories, this is moving particular land use designations into different categories so that the analysis of those impacts will be made within this new category called "Medium Impact"? The Industrial M54 moves into this category as well as some of these Heavy Commercial uses. The Planning Groups/ communities, then, have essentially one more tool in their toolbox in terms of these designations that they can apply to their communities.

Limited Impact Industrial (M52/ I-1)
J. Phillips: At the last meeting, I had some real serious problems with this concept (referred to by M. Beck above) because of the structure of our zoning and our General Plan in Valle de Oro. After a lot more review, I can see where the new concept can be made to work and I would encourage it, but only if we make some changes to the Limited Impact Industrial category because it is going to allow residential and retail. Maybe the retail aspect of it is appropriate, but you run into real problems when you have a "Light Industrial" area, typically condominium or rental "small industrial parks", if you will, and you allow retail in the General Plan, then you'll start seeing things like restaurants go into these facilities and they are not (parked?) to handle a successful retail/ commercial enterprise. Typically, this kind of use will be very harmful to the industrial use because they eat up all of the parking. Trying to put residential in industrial is

suicide in this county. We do not have the services to handle that kind of a mixed use. We do not have the law enforcement services and we do not have the Parks and Recreation services. I would propose that the whole thing about secondary mix be out of there. The retail would have to be under very special circumstances- at least with a Minor Use Permit. Just allowing it in the language description is opening the door to problems in the future. You really need to evaluate an individual application.

Commissioner Beck: (clarified) You're pulling out the secondary uses that would be allowed by right and you're suggesting that they're either eliminated or they go through a use-permit process to refine the decision.

J. Phillips: Yes. Except residential should be pulled out- period.

Rural Commercial (C40/ C-4)
G. Hammers: I'm only focused on C40 because that's all we're going to have in our community. I would say that in C40, residential as a secondary use is an imperative. The one that really catches my eye is "swap meets". If you're talking about an old drive-in theatre that is having swap meets on a regular basis, then I can go along with it. But, if you're talking about the sixth grade class that wants to raise money for their sixth grade camp or a service project wants to have a swap meet once in awhile to raise funds for Little League, then I would say "no". I really need more clarification on what's allowed here as far as swap meets are concerned.

G. Pryor: This pertains to things that would be permanent operations, not fund raisers like you're talking about. There is a separate section of the code that allows for swap meets if you're getting into fund-raising kinds of things.

G. Hammers: I can support C40 as proposed here by pulling out the items on the (Land Use Framework Option) and putting them into M54.

M. Morgan: At the last meeting, I was looking at C40 under "Commercial". There are several issues (11-18, see "Commercial and Industrial Use Analysis"). I think these should have "Major Use Permits", instead of just "Use Permitted" so that we have a review process.

G. Pryor: Keep in mind that you've got to keep separate the land use classification and the General Plan. What you're referring to is in the Zoning Ordinance. That'll come later. We'll make note of that for when we update the zoning.

G. Jemmot: I support what Margarette said about those particular items. I'm curious where green waste processing falls. That is something that has gotten into agricultural areas by people claiming that it is "agricultural".

G. Pryor: "Green Waste" is not an agricultural activity. That's a recycling type operation.

R. Rowan: (in response to R. Hensle's question and brief discussion with G. Pryor- inaudible) I think what Richard was getting at is that if someone had a Medium Industrial designation, it is true that they would have to apply for a zoning change to get to M54. But, it wouldn't require a GPA.

R. Hensle: (for greater clarification) Is it going to be easier to go from C37 to M54 under this new plan?

G. Pryor: No. In that case, it would still require a GPA. Forget the C37 for a minute. If somebody wants to put an (exclusively) industrial activity over into a commercial area, they have to do a GPA. If they are industrial and you allow for the same uses in the commercial as in the industrial, then you don't have to do a GPA to move it from the commercial district to the industrial district. It depends on how you structure it. Everything that fits in a given category would be "by right".

R. Hensle: So now the burden goes to the community as to which areas to designate for this new industrial zone, and so how do we go about "creating" more areas, because there are certainly areas in our community where the people that are up against the C37 areas do not want to get any "worse" going to M54, which it essentially is now. It almost looks like we're stepping from commercial to industrial against residential and we're not solving what was originally the problem- the conflict- between residential and Heavy Commercial.

R. Rowan: That is the choice that each community has to make.
We're not saying that you have to make this change. We're trying to group uses together that have the same impact under the same designation. We recognize that this is one of the GP changes that may need to require some taking a look at the zones that will be impacted by it, and maybe doing a little refinement in those areas, because what is allowed in those zones is quite varied.

G. Hammers: I'd like to focus on the C40 one more time. C40 says "Rural Commercial". "Rural Commercial", I would hope, means *"Rural"* Commercial. If there is any community in the County that is rural, it is Potrero. The comment was made that we should pull "auto repair" out of "Rural Commercial". If there is anything that our community needs, it is an auto repair facility. We have one and I would hate to see us lose it. I would hate to see someone have to go through some sort of permit process for a facility that we really need.

M. Beck: The question really is whether you have it as a tool that you can use in your community. Someone else' use of that does not affect your choice to use it. We are going to try to conclude on (categories) today. We are going to have some action by this group on these items before the end of today.

G. Hammers: What is the sense of having "Rural Commercial" if you're not going to allow "Rural Commercial" uses and are going to require Major Use Permits for everything we need in our community? I am referring to C40 only. I want to keep automotive repair in C40.

(Visitor- out of order) A. Botter: I'm here with a bunch of my friends and neighbors. You're discussing our use of our C37property in a way that is really upsetting all of us.

M. Beck: We are having a technical discussion about these uses and we are going to stay on that. These people who are representing the communities are going to be voting on these issues. If you have a technical point to make, please make it.

A. Botter: My technical point is this- You're going to displace a lot of the people in my neighborhood. To just blank out us is ridiculous. We're C37 and we use our property the way that we are allowed to use the property. For you to go along and say that we should change our zone to an M54 and that will require a re-zone, that is additional burdens and costs to all of my neighbors.

G. Pryor: If you are sitting in a "Heavy Commercial" zone today and it stays "Heavy Commercial" under the GP, there is not any change in that use or classification. If you happen to be in a "Service Commercial" district and that district is eliminated, those uses will be moved either to another commercial class or to an industrial class. One or the other- and that's up to the community. That doesn't necessitate, in all cases, a re-zone, because if the land uses are matched up with the GP classification, it doesn't create re-zones.

R. Hensle: (referring to photos handed out by Antoine Botter) Most of my problems with the C37 and other areas has to do with the front scape- I've never found that about the backyard, it is about the visual from the street. Uses allowable in a C37 should be appropriately screened from the street.

M. Beck: This framework does not *mandate* changes. It basically creates a category in which changes can be made.

MOTION: J. Phillips- S.C. approve staff's proposal with the exceptions that we have accumulated in our discussion from the chairs regarding the individual land use designations that are under discussion (C37 and various Industrial land use designations- see appendix A). Second- G. Hammers.
[Per M. Beck, these exceptions include: 1) residential removed from Limited Impact Industrial, 2) there will be some discussion about the Use Permit process for three of those secondary uses- retail, office, and institutional.]

Vote on MOTION: All in favor. MOTION passes unanimously. MOTION passes unanimously.

Office / Professional (C-2)
J. Phillips: I wanted to go back to C-2 (from last meeting). This and C-3 are not written as a description. I'm thinking of existing facilities, and this change would become problematic. I would like to ask that this whole statement on secondary uses be thrown out because it shouldn't be encouraged. I would say that the existing text does the same thing, because it allows residential uses under special circumstances. The whole secondary commercial use idea is very problematic in a dedicated Office/ Professional area. In our area, we have used Office/ Professional as a buffer zone between Commercial and Residential and it has been very successful.

R. Rowan: The intent here is simply to provide some services to the folks who work in Office/ Professional areas, not to set up large restaurants and other types of facilities. Having these services available reduces automobile use, and generally just is a service to the people who work there.

J. Phillips: It's a Planners dream that comes out as a nightmare. It does not work that way on the ground.

G. Pryor: Would it address your concerns if we word this so that it specifies that the commercial would only be solely for servicing the office complex?

J. Phillips: We have had problems with this.

M. Beck: Is there some language that would limit this in a way that you would accept, or do you totally reject the notion?

Jack: I reject the language, "restaurants should be encouraged". I would not have a serious problem with "internal" commercial uses. You have to go to the current Office/ Professional zone and it defines and allows those kinds of uses under special circumstances.

G. Pryor: (reads from Zoning Ordinance, Section 2980, Supplemental Limtations on Uses- Retail Establishments) "Limited to retail establishments intended for the convenience of permitted establishments and/ or clients thereof, provided no such retail establishment occupies more than 15% of the total floor area of the building in which it is located and has no entrance except for the lobby or interior of said building, or from a patio entirely surrounded by said building." If that's acceptable to everybody, let's take that paragraph that you are objecting to, delete it, and re-craft words that will get us to what I just read.

J. Ferguson: Jack is exactly right. The word "encourage" anywhere in this document should probably be suspect. I'm okay with what Gary said, with some possible exceptions. The signage will also have to be looked at in this case, because the signage in these areas is pretty restricted. If it looks like there is a parking impact implied, a Minor Use Permit might be in order.

G. Pryor: "Encourage" is not in this new definition that we're using. Let me tell you how we solve that (parking and signage) problem. Assuming that we can get an agreement that we are going to have this limited retail, we're going to tailor the Zoning Ordinance to specify whatever square footage they apply for the restaurant will have to meet the restaurant classification for parking (example provided). They'll use the parking as a limiter. Same thing with signage. That should take care of the concerns.

MOTION: (J. Phillips) Approve the designation with the changes made as proposed by G. Pryor. D. van Dierendonck- Second. All in favor. MOTION passes unanimously. [New language will be returned to the group and, if there is any language difficulty, the designation definition may be fine tuned at that time.]

Neighborhood Commercial (C-3)
J. Phillips: The last three lines (beginning with "The Zoning Ordinance should include a distinct zone for this designation…", see p. 10 Land Use Framework handout, 7.15.02). A promise of what the Zoning Ordinance should or shouldn't do should not be in a land use designation.

G. Pryor: You are absolutely correct. The way that we can solve this is if we go to second line, "It is designed to serve only a limited market, and uses should be compatible with adjacent residential uses", we can say that and that does it (see p. 10, Land Use Framework handout, 7.15.02) because then we can come right back in with our design regulators and the Zoning Ordinance and do it. [Staff will remove the last sentence under C-3 description.]

MOTION: Eliminate last sentence under "Neighborhood Commercial (C-3). Second- D. van Dierendonck. All in favor. MOTION passes unanimously.

General Commercial (C34-C36/ C-1)
J. Phillips: When I first read this I had a lot of red that I bled on this page, but a lot of it was related to how the other Commercial designations were going to be handled and a lack of my understanding of Gary's intent when he talked about Zoning overlays. I have a real basic problem in our suburban communities of mixing residential and commercial. In San Diego County, we do not have police protection for areas of mixed residential and commercial use. The mixed use principal works in some very urban environments, but in the unincorporated County

you will see the crime rate go up in these areas. If the strength of this Zoning Ordinance overlay that Gary has written in here is truly what happens - if it takes a zoning change/ amendment to go from pure commercial to mixed use, then there's enough protection.

G. Pryor: We are not proposing that we use mixed use universally. It would require going through the establishment of a mixed use district, which is an overlay. And it can only be applied where you have already pre-determined, like "General Commercial".

MOTION: (J. Phillip) Support the General Commercial (C-1) designation. Second- M. Morgan. All in favor. MOTION passes unanimously.

MOTION: (G. Hammers) Support Rural Commercial w/ elimination of geographic designations (East/ West). Second- L. Glavinic. All in favor. MOTION passes unanimously.

Break at 10:20am for ten minutes.
Resume at 10:30am.

SPAs
R. Rowan: Basically, the proposal is to phase out the use of the SPA designation as it has been used in the County and applied in advance to a piece of property. State guidelines indicate that a SPAs is supposed to be used to implement a general plan. That doesn't mean that you couldn't identify some specific areas in your Community Plan and address policies in those areas, but that's different than applying a SPA designation. The proposal is to phase out the SPA designation and to map the SPAs that have a mixed type of use in a different way than we have now. This would in no way change the legal circumstances associated with a SPA. We included two graphic examples in the back of your (Land Use Framework) (see pp.16-17, Land Use Framework, 7.15.02).

J. Ferguson: In our area we have, basically, only one SPA. When Dixie Switzer was putting our map together for our area, she put part of it in an SPA and part of it in a downzone times four, residential section. You're saying that your mapping techniques would have put it in as a residential section, but would it have put it in as the Specific Plan designated density?

R. Rowan: There are going to be some SPAs where you'll need to leave the map the way it is because the calculated residential density does not match up with any of our standard designations.

G. Pryor: If you've got a SPA that's got a big golf course in it, for example, the density already took into account the golf course. Well, if we map it then somebody could come back later and say, "Well, the density is still on that golf course, so I ought to be able to build houses on the golf course". That's something that we can't let happen because that would be totally inappropriate.

M. Beck: It seems to me that there is a responsibility by DPLU, as well as the Planning Groups. The Planning Groups have to make their recommendations, but DPLU should kind of do the technical support to justify the elimination of those per the new population numbers and all sorts of things. There are a lot of things that have to be reconciled that may not work in the post- 2020 world with respect to infrastructure and that sort of thing, that are in conflict with those SPAs. Is that correct?

G. Pryor: Yes. The other aspect of this that we need to get to is, my guess is, the Planning Groups, with few exceptions, probably don't have the ordinances that went with the SPAs. Because when we re-do the ordinance, we should put in those special provisions. Like 4S Ranch needs to get embedded into that section of the County's ordinance so that everybody picks up on the fact that that is a uniquely different area- that the typical zoning does not apply to it.
D. van Dierendonck: Can we have clarification on that sent to us?

G. Pryor: We haven't done that yet because there are a ton of those things out there.

D. van Dierendonck: We need that because, as it is- the GP2020 right now with seven SPAs in our community- we can plan it right into the ground and if we don't do something about those seven SPAs it will blow it away. We've already run into that just in the density that we built out with the 52, 000. It was based on the SPAs being designated as the pieces of parcels that they had- not as what they could be. The County figured what they could do at maximum and- (pow)- there it went. That accounts for a large part of the difference between our numbers.

J. Phillips: The mistakes in here are the second line (see p.13, Land Use Framework handout, 7.15.02) where the person that wrote this said that "An SPA is typically used to *implement* a general plan". If a SPA actually defines the general plan for the area, it is as though you took our general plan map in these big areas and put "21" on it. That's all that's in that big bubble on our map. You have to go with a Specific Plan map and then it defines everything- all the commercial and multifamily and all of that. I really take offense to the thought that SPAs were used to implement the general plan- they define them. I have a problem with the statement that the County will phase out the SPA designation because that SPA has real open space and has real densities called out for every little area. If you take that direct track away from the general plan and try to define it in some other way, then I think you're placing us at risk because we have thousands of homes built out there based on their relationship to a lot of open space areas. There is no clear cut open space designation being proposed to replace what we have on the SPA mapping. That's very dangerous because, after we're all gone, within five years, if we make this change, that open space will be gone. We don't want the SPAs removed from the lexicon of our area. We use it now and we use it very effectively.

M. Beck: Maybe we need to have a focused discussion on the existing and the notion of future SPAs. In particular, how can we assure that the conditions and standards in the existing SPA remain and can be planned around and depended upon.

G. Pryor: Jack is correct that the way the SPAs were used in the past- they really were not used to implement the general plan. That doesn't meet state law. That's the one that we've got to get rid of right away. The existing ones are different because those areas have already been defined. That's why staff has proposed this diagram (see pp.16-17 Land Use Framework handout, 7.15.02), because you're dealing with two different things. We're concerned with the same thing that Jack is concerned with- that we don't want folks coming back and trying to take another bite of the same apple (i.e., get twice the density by accounting twice for the density allocated to open space).

L. Glavinic: I have what seems to be a classical problem. There are one thousand acres with much of it in floodplain in my area. It has been designated as a SPA. It seems to be a great tool to manage and protect this floodplain area. I would like another tool for these controls.

R. Rowan: Generally speaking, there are a couple of different options. One is that you apply appropriate residential densities depending on the nature of the conditions in that area. A second option is that you have policies that address that particular geographic area in the plan.

G. Jemmot: The first sentence (see p.13, "SPA", Land Use Framework handout, 7.15.02) should say "and/ or industrial uses". The next one is that the sentence after that sort of suggests that the general plan will be considered when a SPA is created. What I heard Gary saying is that a SPA must be the general plan. I would suggest wording which states that, "Newly created SPAs must be in the general plan" or words to that effect.

J. Ferguson: Is it possible to get a copy of the ordinance for SPAs in each area.

G. Pryor: Don't look for this in the next week or two- it is going to take some research. I'll make every effort to get you the ones we can find.

J. Phillips: What is needed for our particular problem is to establish a threshold that addresses how much of a SPA is built out.

J. Ferguson: We've been talking about mapping indications, but there's another level there that we've been sort of skipping. When you remove things from the general plan, you also remove the difficulty, or change the level of difficulty in changing them. The requirements for a GPA are usually more rigorous than the requirements for other changes. The other impact of taking SPAs off of the general plan and putting them at a lower level is that they no longer have GPA protection.

M. Beck: Maybe the group can take action on the staff recommendation to eliminate the "blob" SPAs that are out there that have not been implemented. Staff also proposes to put a density on these areas.

MOTION: (D. van Dierendonck)- Take M. Beck's suggested action. Second- M. Morgan. Favor- 13. Abstain- L. Glavinic.

M. Beck: (to G. Pryor) With these other two categories, those SPAs that are existing- how to secure those conditions that are associated with the SPA and those that are kind of in process- is staff coming back on those?

G. Pryor: Yes. I want to be able to sit down with staff and chew a little bit on some of the implications that are associated with this because of some of the issues that have surfaced. I've got some of the same concerns and I think the staff does, as many of the Planning Group folks have, and that is that we don't want to lose any of the open space or those things that are still out there that were basically used for development, and then let somebody come back in and re-do it.

Tribal Lands

G. Pryor: We've got Tribal Lands that are out there that, right now, we're just going to show them as a designation on the map. We can't do any planning for them. If they give us information we will include that inside the Tribal Lands. If they've got master plans for development, we've encouraged them to give copies of that to us so that we can factor it into roads and water and other things as we look at it.

M. Beck: How is the County going to reconcile potential conflicts between land use designations adjacent to an Indian Reservation which may be Rural Residential and large lot zoning, and the infrastructure needs associated with that- how is the County going to reconcile the potential need to expand the road systems and all these other issues associated with the adjacent high density casino uses. Is the County intending to just unilaterally come to this "therefore" conclusion (based on existence of casinos)- that we have to widen the roadways, etc.? This has these kind of ripple effects.

G. Pryor: We are probably going to model two ways when we look at the roads. We'll look at it without the casinos in place in terms of being able to see what the impact is on the road because then we can add the casino traffic and know what the difference is. We still have a responsibility for public safety and that's where we are going to have some liability, so we may in fact have to look at widening roads. We also know who is going to have to pay for them. That's where you set up cost/ benefit. We can't just ignore the fact that we have a casino that is causing traffic problems.

T. McMaster: (inaudible) Suggested all land uses (residential uses, casinos, etc.) be added to the last sentence describing Tribal Lands (see p.13, Land Use Framework handout, 7.15.02).

Motion deferred until language re-worded.

Public/ Semi-Public Facilities

J. Phillips: The problem is with how this has shown up on our community plan "Working Copy" maps. Public/ Semi-Public should not be used for privately held land. The problem is the relationship of "Public/ Semi-Public" and "Public/ Semi-Public" open space replacing "Impact Sensitive" and doing away with the "Impact Sensitive" designation. If we're going to have open space, it shouldn't have to be designated "Public/ Semi-Public". There should be a separate designation if we're going to worry about this.

R. Rowan: The initial intent of this is to respond to this groups' comment about the fact that our old designation combined the two and made it difficult to know the difference, and there is a big difference between Public/ Semi-Public land that is used for a school facility and a National Park or other types of open space that is Public or Semi-Public. However, other questions have come up that we need to talk through more with this group.

L. Carmichael: We do need to look at it from all of the different perspectives here. We do have some significant acreage in the County that has been purchased for preserves that are not in public ownership. So, do we want to recognize those areas on the general plan as some sort of preserve or open space, that they're not publicly owned? I think the answer to that is "yes, we want to recognize those lands as preserved". The question about how you would then assign density, we still need to refine and work out. But it does seem appropriate, from a mapping standpoint, looking at our County, to recognize those areas.

G. Hammers: On the issue of public v. non-public, I see a big distinction between the school district, the fire district, some other district that has a publicly elected Board versus one that maybe the cemetery type thing that may be privately held. And I would like to see some kind of distinction between them.

P. Brown: Our Planning Group asked staff to eliminate density from areas like the church camps and so forth. I'd like to bring up the issue of privately owned camps, which is a major use up in Julian.

M. Beck: It seems to me these definitions and ownerships and uses are very distinct from one another. So, the difference between "public/ semi-public" and "private", and then definitions like "dedicated" and "designated" open space. So, maybe under this broad category of "open space", we need to really understand all the potential subsets of that, because there's a semantic problem here that really is confusing.

M. Morgan: Something that has come up with us is that we have right in the middle of our density of our community, the Fallbrook Conservancy. And, we can't put a land use designation on this particular land because its right in the middle of our area and we can't put density on it. Now, we have a Bonsall Conservancy and their putting trails together and their putting recreation space together. How do we distinguish and do we have an element called "Recreation" that would be as a land use designator- is that something we can add to it?

G. Pryor: Well, you don't need to get that specific. That's what your "public/ semi-public/ open space" should do- it should basically define what functions are going to be permitted. Remember, I'm not so sure that we have to put a density on every piece of property. We have to classify it. In terms of building intensity, I can classify commercial and industrial and I don't use density- I use a building intensity through the Zoning Ordinance (i.e., height, bulk, rate). I want to look back into this, but I'm not so sure we can't do the same thing on the camps like you're (to P. Brown) talking about. They're not necessarily going to carry a residential density, but we may put a classification on them which will give them a use, but that use is going to be limited to the day camps or the recreational facilities within certain limits which keeps them in the context you're talking about and won't let them convert without coming through for a General Plan amendment. I think I can get that to work, but I need a little bit of time to go back and check the statutes on that.

(Discussion continues in same vain with no new implications.)

G. Pryor: I'm going to try to capture the issues. We're talking about uses of the land, regardless of ownership. The next question is when we're dealing with these "public/ semi-public facilities" or "open spaces", we want to make sure there isn't a conversion of those in the future into something eles, i.e., "residential", "commercial", or "industrial". That, I think, is what is at the heart of the issue here. At the next meeting, staff will return with a more refined proposal that deals with these issues for "open space" and for "Public Facilities".

<u>Public Input</u>

[Question for G. Pryor]: Does Zoning have intentions to eliminate grandfathering rights or put in an amateurization period?

G. Pryor: We're dealing with a case right now, with the Adult Entertainment, where we amended the ordinance and we put in a very short motorization period (3yrs). Right now, the rest of it has still got the grandfathering clause in it that says if you were a legally established [operation] before the zoning or the plan change, you have a right to stay unless mother nature destroys it. That doesn't necessarily have to stay that way. That's a future decision under zoning. That's not part of the General Plan.

M. Allison: Is staff going to have language that addresses responsibilities and conservancies?

G. Pryor: No. That's not part of the General Plan. That's an operating procedure.

Tentative date for next meeting set for August 24th.

Meeting adjourned at 12:12 pm.